



City of Carmel

CARMEL PLAN COMMISSION SUBDIVISION COMMITTEE

August 2, 2005

Minutes

Representing the Committee:

Rick Ripma
Dianna Knoll
Dan Dutcher
Susan Westermeier

Representing the Department:

Nathan Anderson

Of Counsel:

John Molitor

The Subdivision Committee met to consider the following items:

1. **Docket No. 05070002 OA: West Home Place Setback Amendment**
The applicant seeks to amend the Zoning Ordinance, *Chapter 23E.09: West Home Place Commercial Corridor*, in order to reduce setback requirements.
Filed by the Carmel Department of Community Services.

Representing the Petitioner:

Nathan Anderson

The petitioner appeared before the committee to seek an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance.

Petitioner Presentation

- Nathan Anderson – The department had no concerns and recommended forwarding the item back to the full plan commission.

Committee Questions and Comments

- Dan Dutcher – Said he missed the discussion that generated the recommendation and so wanted to be sure he knew what was going on. He went on to clarify the fact that if the Pennsylvania expansion goes through, it will require new set backs or the land will not be developed in the way that the department would like to see under the plan. This issue was brought to light when the Burford Office Park project was being approved.
- Rick Ripma – Noted that Mark Rattermann had some concerns with the set backs, but at the meeting when Burford Office Park presented the building he understood the plan and was OK with the project.
- Rick Ripma also said that the reduced set backs made sense because it would be hard to put a building in when all the land is set aside for the setbacks.
- Dan Dutcher asked if there were any other specific concerns about the set backs when they were proposed.
 - o Rick Ripma said Mark Rattermann had had some concerns but by the end of the meeting he felt OK with it. The public had no concerns.
- *Dianna Knoll made formal motion to forward **Docket No. 05070002 OA: West Home Place Setback Amendment** to the Plan Commission with a positive recommendation. Susan Westermeier seconded it. Motion **APPROVED 4-0** with none opposed.*

2. Docket No. 050300019 PP: West Clay Colony

The applicant seeks to plat 23 lots on 40 acres. The site is located at the NE corner of Hoover Road and W. 116th Street and is zoned S1 (Residential).
Filed by Michael DeBoy.

Representing the Petitioner:

Kevin Roberts, DeBoy Land Development Services.

The petitioner appeared before the committee to seek a primary plat.

Petitioner Presentation

- Kevin Roberts – Noted that the revised landscape plan and mitigation of the subdivision waiver were included in the committee packets.
- Susan Westermeier asked if a revised site plan for the pedestrian paths was requested.

- Nathan Anderson said that two paths, one along Hoover and one along 116th, were requested.
- Kevin Roberts said that he was certain that the graphics represented what was requested by the alternate transportation plan. A 10-foot path was added along 116th Street and a 6-foot path was added on Hoover Road.
- Nathan Anderson asked if Kevin Roberts had added the shared path and sidewalk? There should be a 6-foot sidewalk and a shared bicycle lane with the road along Hoover Road.
- Kevin Roberts was slightly unclear about what was required and Nathan Anderson proceeded to describe to him what was required.
- Kevin Roberts asked what the additional roadway width was for the bicycle path.
 - Nathan Anderson did not know the exact additional width, but said that Mike McBride from the Engineering Department could answer that question for Mr. Roberts.
- Kevin Roberts said that with respect to the landscape plan they added street trees as well as the proper yard trees. The individual lots are going to be planted with streets, and there will be a list of pre-selected trees for the residents to choose their trees from.
- Kevin Roberts had a question about how to plat the right-of-ways for the road with the median and the trees down the center. He wondered if they should plat the right-of-way up to each side of the median and then the median would become common space that is owned by the subdivision?
 - Nathan Anderson said that the department would have to get back with him on that one.
- One other concern that the department had was in regard to the lots facing inward and the thicker buffering. It was asked of the petitioner whether or not Scott Brewer approved the revised landscape plan with the added buffering.
 - Kevin Roberts did not know that Scott Brewer had approved it.

Department Report

- Nathan Anderson reiterated the concerns of the department being the addition of the sidewalk and shared path along Hoover Road, the 10 foot pedestrian path along 116th Street, and landscaping to buffer the backs of the houses that would be seen from Hoover Road and 116th Street pending Scott Brewer's approval of it.
- Kevin Roberts said that they had modified the shape of lot 17 so that the additional landscaping could be squeezed in there.

No Public in attendance

Committee Questions and Comments

- Dianna Knoll asked what lots had existing houses on them.
 - o Kevin Roberts said that there did exist houses on lot 2 and lot 23.
- Dan Dutcher was not sure what was going on with lot 1 and the existing pond. He said that it currently looked like about half of the pond would be taken out, and then he wondered whether the intent would be to move the pond into common area 3.
 - o Kevin Roberts said “Yes, that was the plan.”
- Dan Dutcher then asked if that would not affect the drainage because he was assuming that the pond served a drainage purpose. He also wondered where the water would be piped to across the street.
 - o Kevin Roberts said that it would not affect the drainage and that they would pipe from the pond to the existing outlet through the drainage easement.
- Dan Dutcher also asked the committee if they should require some commitments since part of the proposal is for a subdivision waiver regarding the orientation along 116th and Hoover.
 - o Rick Ripma thinks they should, and he doubts that it will be an issue on the lots presented for this project. The petitioner is also already doing landscaping commitments.
 - o Kevin Roberts said that what is shown on the plans are 19 trees per 100 feet. He also does not think that architectural details should be a problem. The owner will be responsible for the architectural review and he does not want anything substandard in the subdivision. The owner and the owner’s mother are both currently living on the property, though they may move to the Village of West Clay in the future sometime.
- Rick Ripma asked what was required for the paths.
 - o Nathan Anderson said that the 10-foot path will be along 116th Street and the 6-foot path will be along Hoover Road. A shared path is also required along Hoover Road, which is a bike path that is part of the street.
- Kevin Roberts asked why the shared path was preferred to a 10-foot multi-use path?
 - o Nathan Anderson responded that it could have been due to the width of the right-of-way, but that the department would have to look into that for a specific answer.
- Rick Ripma asked what the developer was committing to.
 - o Nathan said that the developer would be committing to the 10-foot pedestrian path along 116th Street as well as the 6-foot sidewalk and the shared bicycle path along Hoover Road.
 - o Rick Ripma asked if the developer would build the shared bicycle path or would they just put money in so that it would be built when the road is built.
 - o Nathan Anderson was not sure if the petitioner would wait until the road was widened or would put in the shared bicycle path up front.
- Rick Ripma asked if there was a commitment for when the 10 foot and 6 foot path would be built.

- Kevin Roberts said that he would build the 10-foot path and the 6-foot path with the subdivision. That was his opinion, he did not want to say the owner would not ask to postpone the paths until there is something to connect to, but Kevin Roberts himself would choose to build the paths with the subdivision if it were his choice.
- Nathan Anderson wanted to make clear that the 6-foot path was a 6-foot sidewalk, which would be concrete.
- Rick Ripma asked about the screening trees and shrubbery and their size as indicated on the landscape plan.
 - Kevin Roberts said that evergreens are measured by height and 6 feet is required.
 - Rick Ripma then asked if everything else was measured by caliber.
 - Kevin Roberts said yes. He believed that 2 inches are required on the shade trees, and the shade trees have been increased to 3.
- Rick Ripma asked if the petitioner could present a drawing of the landscaping at Plan Commission.
 - Nathan Anderson said that an elevation from 116th Street and Hoover Road was required.
- Rick Ripma also asked if the lake was being eliminated in common area 2.
 - Kevin Roberts said that there was no intent to remove that lake.
- Dan Dutcher asked if the committee wanted to require them to have architectural commitments.
 - Rick Ripma said that they should require that, and that he did not think that the petitioner would have any trouble doing that any way.
 - Dan Dutcher asked about what was required before.
 - Rick Ripma said that the chimney chases would be bricked unless they are internal chases. It would be on lot 1, 17, 16, 15, 14, 13, 12, and 11.
- Rick Ripma asked if the petitioner had already committed to putting certain landscaping on the sides of the homes, and backs of the homes along there?
 - Kevin Roberts said that everything is shown as well as some street trees remaining for the balance. Kevin Roberts said that they are not showing any in the yards, no.
- Dan Dutcher said that they had done that with some other developments, but does the fact that the lots are larger and that there are other landscaping commitments remove the need for the lot specific plantings.
 - Rick Ripma said that the committee has set a precedent and so they should stay with it. He also thinks that before they had only required some where around 3 so it should not be a big burden for these large lots.
 - Dianna Knoll was reluctant to require the developer to commit to the planting of a certain number of trees on the lots if it did not affect the community at large. Since the lots are an acre in size she does not see privacy issues and believes that the market will drive some of the design of the lots because the developer will want to sell the lots. She thinks that the

perspective is different when requiring the developer to do certain things when it does not impact community issues.

- Rick Ripma said that the reason that they were asking for the additional trees is because the petitioner was asking for a waiver to face the houses inward instead of toward Hoover Road or 116th Street. Also, the committee has already asked this of previous developments and so he thinks that if they have set a precedent then they should stick with it.
 - Kevin Roberts said that there were only 8 lots in question and so if the committee wanted to impose 3 additional trees per lot it would not be a huge burden.
- *Dan Dutcher made formal motion to forward **Docket No. 05030019 PP: West Clay Colony and Docket No. 05060054 SW** to the Plan Commission with a positive recommendation pending the following **1.** Commitment to a 10 foot multi-use recreation path along 116th Street and a 6 foot sidewalk and shared bike path along Hoover Road, both to be constructed when the development is constructed, **2.** Approval of the landscape plan by Scott Brewer, **3.** Review to the department's satisfaction of elevations for 116th Street and Hoover Road, **4.** Architectural commitments for the lots that are subject to the subdivision waiver requests including brick wrap, brick chimney chase, and at least 3 backyard trees per lot, and **5.** Preservation of the lake in common area 2. Susan Westermeier seconded it. Motion **APPROVED** 4-0, with none opposed.*
- Kevin Roberts said that if there was a situation that involved road widening then they might ask to postpone the path.
- It was asked if there were any signs that needed to be approved, or if they would go through ADLS. There was no definite answer, and Susan Westermeier made a note to ask about that.

There was no further business to come before the Committee and the meeting was adjourned at 6:45 PM.

Rick Ripma, Chairperson

Alexia Donahue Wold, Secretary Pro Tem